

From: [Phil North](#)
To: [Andrew Howe](#)
Cc: [Ana Greene](#); [Brenda Gibson](#); [Dianne Lyles](#); [Mark Jen](#); [Megan Thyng](#); [Sandra Caesar](#)
Subject: Re: Work Plan and Cost Estimate-WA 3-22
Date: 05/20/2011 10:35 AM

Andrew,
Thanks for your comments. As a newby to the realm of contracts this kind of information is really helpful to me.

As a next step would it be best for me to go through the workplan and make changes to propose back to NatureServe? Or perhaps the discussion you propose would be best to have first to better educate any changes I make. What next step would you propose.

Phil

Phillip North
Ecologist
Environmental Protection Agency
Kenai River Center
514 Funny River Road
Soldotna, Alaska 99669
(907) 714-2483
fax 260-5992
north.phil@epa.gov

"To protect your rivers, protect your mountains."

▼ Andrew Howe---05/20/2011 09:19:22 AM---Hi All, I have read over the WorkPlan for WA 3-22. I am not an expert on the subject matter, but I

From: Andrew Howe/DC/USEPA/US
To: Ana Greene/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Brenda Gibson/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Dianne Lyles/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Mark Jen/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Megan Thyng/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Phil North/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Sandra Caesar/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Date: 05/20/2011 09:19 AM
Subject: Re: Work Plan and Cost Estimate-WA 3-22

Hi All,

I have read over the WorkPlan for WA 3-22. I am not an expert on the subject matter, but I have concerns on this contractually. I apologize up front for this long email.

Work Assignments are essentially mini contracts. Contracts and proposals are typically very detailed with exact specifications on deliverables for task, due dates for deliverables, etc. If items need to be changed, that is fine, but it must be submitted, approved, documented, and so on. IG has been monitoring and reviewing contracts a lot lately.

After reviewing this WA 3-22, I found it to be lacking in details and specifics in some areas.

Here are some examples:

page 2, 4th paragraph. - Unacceptable. WA 3-20 has a delivery due by June 30th or if WA-22 is initiated before June 30th, NatureServe must provide a summary report of all work completed to date for each task. I believe after talking to Phil the other day he is going to talk this over with Mark and then NatureServe.

page 2, 6th paragraph. - "He will interview, record and interpret data ... as is possible given budget and time limitations." Items like this should be more defined. Exactly how many is expected to visit and what time frames.

page 4 and 5. - Task C, Task D, Task E, Task F. As I mentioned before, I am not versed in the subject matter, but "review and document" means what? What is the deliverable, or what will be provided to the EPA as proof of work performed? What is the date that it will be provided by?

page 5, 5th paragraph. - "2 or 3" additional experts, "ISER staff", "ISER may arrange for one or two of its staff". These statements are vague. How many ISER staff, for what purpose, how many experts, for what purpose? This pertains to travel and thus cost more for more people.

page 9, 3rd paragraph. - Timing. Timing of deliverables should be clearly stated.

page 9, 4th paragraph. - "This Work Plan and Cost Estimate are therefore entirely contingent upon obtaining fully executed subcontracts from all the specified team members or the universities/corporations." NatureServe should have agreements/contracts in place before a Work Assignment begins.

page 9, 5th paragraph. - The fifth paragraph states deliverable #1 is still being defined, etc. The deliverable should be defined and NatureServe should have specifics in it for the Work Plan. I believe Phil is working on this.

These are the type of items that when the a Work Plan is reviewed we should think about.

I hope everyone does not feel that I am being too critical about this, but my goal is to make the process easier in the future by spending the time and making sure all the items/tasks/deliverables, etc. is clearly defined and understood up front.

It may be helpful to have a meeting with contracting, Ana, project officer, etc to review submitted Work Plans for NatureServe so that we can help each other out and make suggestions that will provide for a more complete Work Plan. Over time I would expect that NatureServe

learns what we are looking for in the Work Plan and we will not need to spend as much time reviewing them.

If you have any questions or comments, please let me know.

Thanks you,

Andrew J. Howe

Contract Specialist
U.S Environmental Protection Agency || Office of Acquisition Management
Information Resources Management Procurement Service Center
phone: 202.564.5739 || fax: 202.565.2554
email: Howe.Andrew@epa.gov

▼ Kat Maybury ---05/10/2011 05:14:33 PM---Dear Ana and Dianne, Please accept the attached as our work plan and cost estimate for the expanded

From: Kat Maybury <Kat_Maybury@natureserve.org>
To: Ana Greene/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Dianne Lyles/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Andrew Howe/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Brenda Gibson/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Megan Thyng/DC/USEPA/US@EPA, Phil North/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Mark Jen/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Courtney Ravert <Courtney_Ravert@natureserve.org>, Valerie Hazen <Valerie_Hazen@natureserve.org>, Leslie Honey <Leslie_Honey@natureserve.org>
Date: 05/10/2011 05:14 PM
Subject: Work Plan and Cost Estimate-WA 3-22

Dear Ana and Dianne,
Please accept the attached as our work plan and cost estimate for the expanded Bristol Bay Work Assignment (3-22). Please contact me with any questions.
Thanks,
Kat

Kat Maybury
Multi-Jurisdictional Data Program Manager
NatureServe
1101 Wilson Blvd., 15th floor
Arlington, VA 22209
703-908-1882
kat_maybury@natureserve.org

My normal work schedule is M, Tu, W, and F.

[attachment "3-22_Cost_Estimate_Final.pdf" deleted by Phil North/R10/USEPA/US]

[attachment "WA3-22_WorkPlan_Final.pdf" deleted by Phil North/R10/USEPA/US]